

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/15/2003	Yee-Chia Yeo	TSM03-0926	7692
0 10/07/2008 SIL, L.L.P.	EXAMINER		
ROAD, SUITE 1000	MOVVA, AMAR		
252		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2894	
			DELIVERY MODE PAPER
	10/07/2008 SIL, L.L.P.	SIL, L.L.P. ROAD, SUITE 1000	1007/2508

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/685,938	YEO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
AMAR MOVVA	2894	

	AWAR WOVVA	2094				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 16 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.				
<ol> <li>X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following i application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods.</li> </ol>	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing     The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A     no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire le	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth	in the final rejection, whi	chever is later. In			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (a) above, if checket, Any reply re-ceived by the Office is remay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origithan three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the filed with the notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the filed with the filed with the notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the f	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
AMENDMENTS	unin the time period set forth in 57	DF IX 41.57 (a).				
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better		lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for			
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims				
NOTE: Claim 13 is substantively amended. (See 3		ottod ciairris.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mnliant Amendment (	PTOL -324)			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		- I pilatit / Unionalitic (i				
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [         how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov     </li> </ol>		be entered and an e	xplanation of			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	before or on the date of fling a bla	tion of Annualill not	ha antouad			
<ul> <li>The allidavit of other evidence field after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ul>						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a			
10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). ( 13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
	/Bradley K Smith/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2894				

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

- Applicant argues that even if the definition of a substrate only requires that the substrate support a layer thereon, the silicide regions (10c, 10d, fig. 41) must support the isolation region (4c, fig. 41). Examiner notes, however, that the relicion states that elements 10c, 10d are only part of the substrate. To the contrary the substrate includes (3,2,10c,10d, fig. 41). There is no requirement that the isolation completely overified ill parts of the substrate.
- 2. Applicant argues that if elements 10c/10d of Matsumoto could be considered part of the substrate so could 12e/12f. Examiner notes that at times the broad nature of claim language would allow for multiple interpretations of the prior art. The mere fact that there maybe multiple interpretations available to use does not preclude the ability of a specific interpretation from reading on the claims. Even assuming arguendo that examiner is forced to take applicant suggested interpretation that 12e/12f are part of the substrate, examiner notes that these plays still support dements 13f/13e and layers thereon. Applicant further argues that that netlier to structures may be considered to be the substrate of the isolation region 4e. This argument is moot as there is no requirement that specific portions of the substrate is not forced. (3e,10e,10e,10e,10e,10e). The rejection states that elements 10c,10d are only part of the substrate. To the contrary the substrate includes (3e,210e,10e,10e,10e,11e).